

Piore, Michael—Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Polenske, Karen—Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Quinn, Joseph—Boston College.

Reich, Michael—University of California at Berkeley.

Reynolds, Lloyd G.—Yale University.

Scherer, F.M.—Harvard University.

Schor, Juliet B.—Harvard University.

Shaikh, Anwar—Jerome Levy Economics Institute.

Smeeding, Tim—Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences.

Smolensky, Eugene—University of California at Berkeley.

Stromsdorfer, Ernst W.—Washington State University.

Summers, Anita A.—University of Pennsylvania.

Summers, Robert—University of Pennsylvania.

Tobin, James—Yale University.

Vickrey, William—Columbia University.

Voos, Paula B.—University of Wisconsin.

Vroman, Wayne—Urban Institute.

Watts, Harold—Columbia University.

Whalen, Charles J.—Jerome Levy Economics Institute.

Wolff, Edward—New York University.

SMALL BUSINESS EXEMPTION

Mr. KENNEDY. Finally, Mr. President, an op-ed article in today's USA Today by Jack Faris, president and CEO of the National Federation of Independent Business, perpetuates the fallacy that Congress acted by mistake in 1989 when it increased the small business exemption under the so-called enterprise coverage test, but failed to do so for the so-called individual coverage test. In fact, Congress was well aware of the effect of its actions in 1989. There was no mistake.

Since the beginning, the minimum wage has covered large numbers of workers engaged in interstate commerce, regardless of the size of the firms they work for.

In fact, the original minimum wage, enacted in 1938, contained only the individual coverage test. That coverage was based on the view that Congress had broad power under the commerce clause of the Constitution to protect workers even in the smallest firms, as long as the workers were involved in interstate commerce.

From 1938 to 1961, coverage was based only on that principle—individual coverage—a case-by-case, worker-by-worker analysis as to whether the actual work involved interstate commerce.

At the beginning, the minimum wage also contained numerous exemptions based largely on policy decisions and interest group pressures. In some cases, entire industries or occupations were excluded from coverage. In the years since 1938, the major goals of Congress have been not only to increase the purchasing power of the minimum wage—or at least prevent a decline in its purchasing power because of inflation—but also to reduce the scope of these broad exemptions.

Notwithstanding the numerous industry specific exemptions, Congress never enacted a general exemption for small businesses. Since the beginning, many workers in very small firms have

continued to be protected by the minimum wage under the individual coverage test.

In 1961, with the economy having grown rapidly in the years after World War II, and with vastly increased economic activities crossing State lines, Congress changed the definition of coverage of the minimum wage to achieve coverage in a more practical way.

The 1961 act specified that all workers in enterprises with more than a certain level of annual sales would be regarded as engaged in interstate commerce, and would therefore be covered by the minimum wage, whether or not the particular activities of individual workers in the firms involved interstate commerce. This new test of coverage was widely referred to as enterprise coverage.

The sales figure for the standard was set at various levels for various industries. For enterprises comprised exclusively of retail service establishments, the threshold for coverage was set at \$362,500. For most other industries, the threshold was \$250,000. But for hospitals, schools, public agencies, and enterprises engaged in construction, laundry, or drycleaning, the threshold was zero—all employees in those industries were covered, regardless of the size of their firm.

The addition of enterprise coverage was an expansion, not a reduction, of coverage. It was not a small business exemption from coverage—it was a large business expansion of coverage. It meant that workers in firms with sales above the threshold were protected by the minimum wage, regardless of their personal status in interstate commerce. They were covered, because their employers were involved in interstate commerce.

Under the 1961 act, workers in firms below the specified level of annual sales continued to be covered under the previous case-by-case, worker-by-worker standard, the so-called individual coverage.

One result of the broad increase in coverage by the 1961 act under enterprise coverage was the narrowing of the previous blanket exemption for workers in small retail firms and service firms. Workers in firms below the threshold in those industries for enterprise coverage continued to be exempted from individual coverage, even if they were engaged in interstate commerce. Above the threshold, workers in those industries were covered for the first time by the minimum wage.

That basic dual structure of enterprise coverage and individual coverage has continued since 1961. In 1989, Congress enacted a large increase in the threshold of coverage under the enterprise test—to \$500,000 in annual sales. That increase, if enacted by itself, would have reversed the 50-year history of expansions of coverage of the minimum wage, by excluding an estimated 3 million workers from its coverage under the enterprise test.

That reduction in coverage was unacceptable by itself—so Congress offset

the reduction by repealing the blanket exemption for workers in retail and service firms under the individual coverage test. For such firms, the pre-1961 case-by-case worker-by-worker test was reinstated. If the workers were engaged in interstate commerce, they were covered by the minimum wage.

In recent years, some, like Mr. Faris, have attempted to argue that Congress mistakenly repealed the blanket exemption for these small retail and service firms. It is clear that some Members of Congress thought they were voting for a blanket small business exemption when they voted to increase the threshold for the enterprise test to \$500,000. But those Members of Congress were ignoring the longstanding principle of individual coverage—which the 1989 act did not abandon, and for good reason.

The overall legislative history of the 1989 act makes very clear that Congress intended to repeal the exemption for small retail and service firms. Otherwise, the entire legislation would have made no sense. The large increase in the threshold for enterprise coverage would have meant that 3 million workers were no longer covered by the minimum wage. Repeal of the exemption for small retail and service firms under individual coverage expanded that aspect of coverage by about the same number of workers. That result was intended by Congress, since the expansion of individual coverage offset the reduction in enterprise coverage. Without that fundamental compromise, the 1989 act would never have been approved by Congress.

So I hope my Republican colleagues will reflect again on this legislative history, and reconsider their attempt to reduce coverage of the minimum wage by exempting so many workers from its protection. Those who work for small firms deserve an increase in the minimum wage. They have waited 5 years for a fair increase, and now is the time for Congress to enact it.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE MINIMUM WAGE

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I commend my colleague, the senior Senator from Massachusetts, for his excellent remarks this morning in discussing the important issue of the minimum wage.

Harry Truman once said: "Republicans favor a minimum wage, the minimum possible wage." I think that a lot of what was said in the 1940's may be applicable today, with a 1996 twist, which is: The minimum possible wage for the minimum number of people to

be affected. That, really, is the debate that we will have today and tomorrow with regard to the Bond amendment.

I want to call everyone's attention to the Bond amendment for what it is and what it is not. The Bond amendment, in many cases and in many ways, could be described as a Swiss cheese approach to the minimum wage; Swiss cheese, because it has so many holes it does not provide for the kind of continuity, the kind of opportunity that everyone ought to have if the minimum wage is to be an applicable national wage.

There are four very specific issues that it addresses in a very harmful manner, for those who are dependent upon the minimum wage. I want to discuss very briefly each of those four this afternoon. Suffice it to say, the Bond amendment is truly a vote against the minimum wage and against working families who depend upon it. It gives with one hand and takes with the other. It uses exemptions, denials, and delays to provide minimum wage increases to a minimum possible number of people. It is a more extreme version of this amendment than what was defeated in the House a couple of months ago.

The Bond amendment, No. 1, effectively denies an increase to all workers for the first 6 months of employment. It does not matter whether you are young or you are old, whether you are working for summer earnings or have to feed a family, whether you are with or without any experience, that provision in the Bond amendment would simply deny, for 6 months of employment, any opportunity to benefit whatsoever from the minimum wage.

The House-passed bill applies the subminimum to workers under the age of 20 for the first 3 months of employment. Already that is an extreme provision in some respects. The Bond amendment is even worse. The high turnover in these jobs is an inevitability, so many workers would never get an increase. I can see in some cases right now where someone will work for 5 months and 2 weeks and then find he or she is going to be left without work because to increase that person's wage would be something the small business owner may not want to do. So, in essence, you are going to get churning of people, regardless of what age they are; working for 5 months and 2 weeks or 5 months and 3 weeks, only to be denied a minimum wage job after that.

I believe most employers are very honest, hard-working people who care a lot of about their employees. But how many unscrupulous employers will there be, people who will find ways in which to avoid the law, avoid paying the minimum wage, avoid living up to their responsibility and find a way to keep people at this extraordinarily low, subminimum level?

The President feels so strongly about this provision alone that he said he would veto the bill if this provision is in the legislation when it reaches his desk.

Second, the Bond amendment denies an increase for any employee of companies with less than \$500,000 in annual sales. Mr. President, these companies employ 10.5 million people. They make up two-thirds of all workplaces today. They include not only retail and service establishments, but manufacturing firms as well. Their employees already are denied benefits of most Federal worker protection laws. They earn lower wages, get fewer benefits, and have less job security than virtually anybody in the country. They should not be stripped of their minimum wage protections as well.

Over and above everything else, to say that a worker who only has the option of working in a company with sales less than \$500,000, who probably does not get health insurance, probably does not get any other worker protection at the Federal level and probably has less job security, but at the same time now may also be denied even minimum wage protection is wrong. That is extreme, and that is something that we simply must oppose.

A third provision denies any raise to waitresses or waiters or other tipped employees. Right now employers need to pay only 50 percent of the minimum wage, or \$2.13 an hour for tipped employees. Instead of maintaining that 50 percent employer payment, the Bond amendment freezes it for all perpetuity at \$2.13. We could be here 20 years from now, and if the Bond amendment were to be adopted, anybody who worked in a restaurant would be frozen at \$2.13, dependent entirely upon tips for any kind of an increase in a living wage.

This is especially a problem for women, because 80 percent of tipped employees today are women. In 1995, about half of full-time waitresses earned roughly \$250 a week, less than the poverty level for a family of three. Just last year, half of the full-time people who worked on tips earned roughly \$250 a week. So what we are going to tell all of those people, 80 percent of whom are women, is, "You're going to have to live with a frozen minimum wage at \$2.13 an hour for all perpetuity. There isn't any option for an increase. You don't have any opportunity to see your wages increase along with everybody else's. That \$250 that you may be getting right now to feed your two kids, well, keep in mind we want to keep you off welfare, we're going to kick you off welfare, we're going to tell you to go get a job, go get child support, get health insurance, go find a way to clothe and house your kids, do all of that, but we're going to freeze your wage at \$2.13 an hour."

Mr. President, I cannot believe that this body is prepared to say that. If we want to reward work, if we want to protect families, if we want to find ways to ensure the children are going to grow in an environment that allows a mother to be home at least part of the time instead of getting three and four jobs, staying at home with children instead of working at wages that

pay \$2.13 an hour, then it would seem to me that they, above and beyond just about anybody else, ought to be entitled to some increase in the minimum wage.

The final thing is, this amendment delays the date of the minimum wage for another 6 months. When the House Members passed their bill, they said it was going to go into effect virtually on Independence Day, on July 4—actually, July 1, a couple of days before Independence Day—in the hopes that maybe some families out there could declare some independence economically, some opportunity to be a little freer than they are right now.

The Bond amendment says, "No, no, that's too fast. If you earn minimum wage today, we're going to ask you to wait until after next Christmas before you're entitled to any increase in the minimum wage. You're not going to get it in July, you're not going to get it by Labor Day, the day we set aside to honor working families. No, we're going to make you wait until after next Christmas. We're going to wait until next January before this wage goes into effect." This is on top of months of delay caused by a Republican filibuster to the minimum wage.

Mr. President, minimum wage workers have gone without a raise now for 5 years. We have had raises. Most people have had raises in this country over the last 4 and 5 years. How remarkable it is that those same people who espouse welfare reform, who want to join with us in providing real opportunities for work, to encourage work, would say that the one thing that would probably encourage work more than anything else, an increase in the minimum wage, is something we just should not do. We should not do it for tipped employees, we should not do it for employees in businesses that have less than a \$500,000 gross income, we should not do it for the first 180 days for anybody who is on minimum wage. Regardless of what else happens, we better not even do it until 1997.

I must tell you, Mr. President, I have a hard time understanding the motivation for those who would want to say that to over 10.5 million people—actually close to 14 million workers—in this country. This delay equals the loss of more than \$500 in pay, money that could go for the health care and the food and housing that kids are going to need.

Every day on the floor somebody with good judgment and with good reason comes to lament the destruction of the family, comes to lament the destruction of this nuclear core that we think so much about and that we think really is the key to a civilized society. We cannot understand why there are teenagers out on the street making trouble for the rest of society. We do not understand why they lost their values. We cannot figure out why there is an increase in juvenile crime and truancy and all the other problems.

Mr. President, I will tell you why. The reason is because more and more

mothers and fathers are forced to leave their homes, unable to take care of their children, because they have three or four jobs they have to hold to make ends meet. That is what this is all about.

So if we are ever going to get back to making sure that the family is protected, making sure those children have core values with which to ensure that they will be productive parts of society, then it seems to me we have to understand that it all starts with the paycheck and whether or not families have the dignity and the opportunity that they must be accorded to ensure that there is some paycheck security in their families.

Minimum wage workers are not what many people think they are. Two-thirds of them are adults; 40 percent are sole breadwinners; 60 percent are women. Minimum wage workers' earnings account for almost half of the families' total earnings today.

So, Mr. President, this is going to be, of all the votes we cast, one of the most critical votes we are going to cast this year, because it sends a clear message out there that we hear you, we know how insecure so many people feel today because of their inability to pay their bills. Not that they are not working hard enough; they are working harder and longer than other families in history. They are making the hard choices about going out and finding another job or staying home and taking care of their children.

America is going to watch this vote. They are going to watch to see whether we vote for the Swiss cheese Bond amendment, the one with all the holes in it, the one that devastates the minimum wage law for the first time in decades, or whether we are going to stand up and say, at long last, America needs a raise after 5 years.

Those who are on minimum wage deserve it. If we want to keep them off welfare, they deserve at least a 90-cent increase. That is all we are proposing here. It is time we do it. Inflation has eaten away 95 percent of the last increase. At the current level of \$4.25 an hour, many minimum wage workers who work 40 hours a week do not earn enough to keep their families out of poverty. How sad that is today.

So unless we act, the minimum wage is going to fall to the lowest level in 40 years. This does not have to be partisan. The last time we voted on this it was bipartisan. Six weeks ago, the House voted overwhelmingly in favor of it; 93 House Republicans voted for it. The vast majority, I am told, over 80 percent of the American people, want to see it increased.

This is a chance to do something right. It is a chance for us to stop stalling, to send a clear message to people across this land that we recognize how important your paycheck and your long-term security is, we recognize how important your family is, we recognize that if we are going to urge you to stay off welfare and go to work, that you

need a wage to do it. That is what this does. It is important we pass a minimum wage increase. It is important we defeat the Bond amendment. It is important at long last we sign the increase into law.

Mr. KENNEDY. Will the Senator yield for a very brief question?

Mr. DASCHLE. Yes. I will be happy to.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I included in the RECORD the statement by the National Retail Federation that was put out on July 1. The National Retail Federation is the largest retail trade association in the country. In their front page they referenced the minimum wage fight in the Senate. They say President Clinton says he will veto the minimum wage increase if it passes, talking about this particular proposal. "Let him." "It is our last chance and best hope for stopping the minimum wage increase this year," referring to the Bond amendment.

So here is the largest retail association saying effectively that the best way to stop any increase in the minimum wage is to support the Bond amendment. I have concluded that was really a devious measure in the sense that people want to have it both ways.

This is my question: Whether the Senator would think that the argument might be made to those who support the Bond amendment, well, you can vote for it; it is an increase in the minimum wage. But on the other hand, for reasons that the Senator has outlined so well this afternoon, effectively it gives with the one hand and takes away with the other hand.

I am just wondering if this is really the purpose: Our best chance and best hope for stopping the minimum wage increase this year. Here is the largest retail organization making this clear statement. We ought to call a spade a spade and say that effectively the Bond amendment is really an effort to stop and halt any increase to the minimum wage. That would be the result of it were it to pass. So the vote would be very clear in terms of who is on the side of working families and who is not. I am just wondering what conclusion the Senator from South Dakota would reach on that.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, if I could—I will use whatever leader time I may require. I know our time runs out at 2 o'clock. Given the fact no one else is here at this point, I will use leader time to the extent necessary to respond to the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KEMPTHORNE). The Senator may use his leader time.

Mr. DASCHLE. The Senator from Massachusetts is absolutely right. In many respects, I think there are some of our colleagues who would like to have it both ways. They would like to say, "Yes, I voted for a minimum wage increase," but then go tell some of their business constituents, "But really I didn't. I really didn't. This is not a

real minimum wage because we exempt virtually everybody."

I was home last weekend, and I just took my own poll. I asked retailers, I asked people in just about every line of business I could find in South Dakota, "What do you think? What do you think about raising the minimum wage? Is this something that you oppose? Would this hurt you badly? What are your thoughts?"

I was amazed, just amazed at the level of sophistication, about the compassion, about the recognition of the importance of this issue, about how troubled many of our employers are in watching their employees try to make ends meet by holding down two and three jobs, because they know that one job is not going to be enough.

One employer told me, "You know, TOM, I really don't know how these employees do it today. I go home and I watch the baseball game at night when I finish work. Some of my employees go to their second job. And their spouses are already at a second or third job. I don't know, but more and more I'm seeing their kids out in the streets because I know they're not home taking care of them."

I had an employee tell me the only dinner—the only dinner—they have together is after church on Sunday once a week. The whole family now gets together for dinner once, on a Sunday, because they have no time during the week, no time because everybody is working even harder carrying out second and third jobs. As a result, the kids cook for themselves. The kids are doing whatever they have to. Hopefully they are doing their homework.

But, Mr. President, that is exactly what we are trying to talk about here. We are trying to address a real and growing problem. If we are serious about family, if we are serious about trying to keep them together and teach our youngsters values, who is to do it if the family is not together? Can you teach all the values that you have to share with a young person growing up on a Sunday after church? I do not think so.

So, while some of our colleagues would like very much to be able to say, "I voted for a minimum wage," but then secretly, "I voted to gut it," let me tell you, there are a lot of business people, at least in South Dakota, who see it for what it is, who recognize that we have to do what is honorable here. It is time we recognized that people on minimum wage need more than just \$4.25 an hour to survive if they are going to take care of their kids. So I appreciate very much the distinguished Senator's raising the question. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous agreement, the Senator from Georgia, Mr. COVERDELL, is to control the next 90 minutes.

Mr. COVERDELL addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. COVERDELL. It is my understanding that for the next 90 minutes, I or my designee have control of that time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. COVERDELL. Very good.

FBI FILES AT THE WHITE HOUSE

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, on Wednesday, July 3, which, incidentally, was the cost-of-Government day, which means the last day after which an American family finally quit paying Government—July 4 took on a special meaning because it was not only Independence Day, but because it is the first day a family could keep its own check. But, interestingly enough, in the midst of all the debate, a very interesting editorial appeared in the Washington Post, which characterizes itself as an independent newspaper.

On July 3, the Washington Post said, "FBI Files and the ex-FBI Author." That was the name of the article. It says:

Controversy swirls around both [these issues], but it ought to be possible to separate the probe of the improperly requisitioned FBI reports by the Clinton White House from the effort to sort out fact from fiction in former FBI agent Gary Aldrich's book about life at the White House.

I agree with this. I agree that the commentary of a popular book ought to be separate from the very, very serious issue of hundreds of our citizens' personal FBI files going to the—hundreds. At this time the current number keeps going up. It started out 300. Then it went to 407. Then it went to 600. Then 700. The last report I have seen is 900. It is almost beyond belief. Both that the White House could request those personal files and that those files could be violated by our own Federal Bureau of Investigation.

The Post says:

The three probes need to find out if the country has an abuse of presidential power on its hands or whether it is witnessing yet one more White House staff-administered blow to this president's prestige.

Mr. President, for my own part, while there is deep concern about what has transpired at the White House, I think so far the public discourse underestimates what transpired at the Federal Bureau of Investigation. It is beyond my understanding how this many personal files or the data in those files could be copied and so routinely made available to the White House without fire alarms and sirens going off from the front to the back door and all the way to the Director's office. I cannot imagine how this could happen. Now, the Director has said there was an egregious breach of honor between the White House and the FBI, but much more will have to be answered than that simple question.

Mr. President, I see we have been joined by the distinguished Senator from Arizona. I yield up to 15 minutes to the Senator from Arizona for his remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Georgia both for taking time to get into this matter and also for yielding time to me.

I was perplexed, to say the least, as I sat through hearings as a member of the Senate Judiciary Committee just before the Fourth of July break, hearing testimony from Mr. Livingstone and others regarding this matter of the FBI files. I am going to come back to some conclusions that came out of that hearing and some questions that remain in a moment.

I thought, first, perhaps, it would be useful to discuss generally what we have here. There have been, especially in the time since Watergate, numerous investigations of officials involved in different administrations. To some extent, I think this has been politically motivated. To a large extent, I think it is a process that is important in a democracy, because people need to have confidence in their Government, particularly when people in high places are accused of wrongdoing or there is a potential of wrongdoing. We have established a system whereby an independent kind of investigator or prosecutor called the special counsel is appointed by the Attorney General, with court acquiescence, to investigate matters. There have been prosecutions from time to time in administrations since the Watergate matter that have demonstrated it is wise to have these kinds of special counsel available to look into such matters.

While there may be some politics involved, and certainly Republicans believe there is politics involved in some of the investigations in the Reagan and Bush administrations, and I am sure that some Democrats believe there is glee in Republican ranks to find things wrong now in a Democratic administration, the fact is it is still important to try to get to the bottom of some of these matters, particularly where it goes beyond politics. I think it can be demonstrated with this administration that it has gone far beyond politics, that there has been wrongdoing, and that there are people in this administration that, to say the least, have been ethically challenged.

As a matter of fact, Mr. President, according to an article written by Mary McGrory in the Washington Post,

President Clinton said that his administration would be the most ethical administration in the history of the Republic.

That was shortly after he was inaugurated. I think history will reveal that this is one of the most ethically challenged administrations in the history of the Republic. This FBI scandal is, frankly, just the latest of the scandals in the Clinton White House. As the Senator from Georgia pointed out, this involves the misuse of about 900—at least that is the number we have so far—900 FBI files.

Going back to reflect on what has occurred earlier in this administration,

and again this is not really partisan because if you look at the last three Presidents, President Carter, President Reagan, and President Bush, I think almost all Americans would agree that all three of these Presidents had the highest ethical standards, Carter a Democrat, the other two Republicans. It did not matter what their politics were. I think most Americans believe that all three of them are people of the greatest integrity and repute. To the extent there was any wrongdoing in any of their administrations each one of them had accusations made, they took responsibility, they tried to clean house, and their integrity, I think, remains without question.

In this particular administration, look at what we have. We have first of all, Roger Altman, Treasury Secretary who misled Congress about his discussions of a Whitewater-connected S&L. He resigned. Henry Cisneros, the HUD Secretary under investigation by court-appointed counsel for lying to the FBI. Mike Espy, former Secretary of Agriculture, under investigation for taking illegal gifts. He resigned. Web Hubble, a very close associate of the President and First Lady, Associate Attorney General, has been sentenced to 21 months in jail for mail fraud and tax evasion. William Kennedy, former associate White House counsel, and possibly one of the people involved in the hirings of Craig Livingstone, failed to pay Social Security taxes and resigned. Bernard Nussbaum, former White House counsel, resigned his post after being accused of improper contacts with Whitewater investigators. David Watkins, former White House director of administration, resigned after he used a Presidential helicopter to play golf. Hazel O'Leary, Secretary of Energy, has committees looking after her travel, and though she is still in the job, questions remain. More than a dozen indictments relating generally to Whitewater, most resulting in plea bargains, if not convictions. As a matter of fact, three close associates of the President were convicted by a jury, including the President's hand-picked successor, Gov. Jim Guy Tucker.

Then the Travelgate matter. It was as a result of the Travelgate investigation that the information about the FBI files came out. It was, really, quite by accident. The House committee investigating the Travelgate matter had asked for 3,000 documents, all of which had been denied by the White House, 3,000 documents. Finally, under threat of subpoena and contempt of Congress if they did not comply with the subpoena, the White House agreed to turn over one-third of those documents. It was one of those 1,000 documents that led investigators of the House committee into the FBI file issue, because there was a reference to FBI files having been obtained, I think, perhaps, relating to Billy Dale who was the fired head of the Travel Office of the White House. The rest, as is commonly said, is history.